

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	O. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNE	Y DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/082,132	0/082,132 02/26/2002		Stephen W. Hoxie	WRA	WRAIR99-54 04		
27370	7590	07/05/2006			EXAMINER		
OFFICE OF THE STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE					TOMASZEWSKI, MICHAEL		
		L RESEARCH ANI	D MATERIEL COMMAND		TUNIT	PAPER NUMBER	

U.S. ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH AND MATERIEL COMMAND ATTN: MCMR-JA (MS. ELIZABETH ARWINE) 504 SCOTT STREET FORT DETRICK, MD 21702-5012

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

3626

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
	Application No.							
Office Action Surrence	10/082,132	HOXIE ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Mike Tomaszewski	3626						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Ju</u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 June 2006</u> .							
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This								
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) <u>1-20 and 28-42</u> is/are pending in the application.								
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>10-20 and 36-40</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6) Claim(s) 1-9,28-35,41 and 42 is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 February 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Patent Application (PTO-152)							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/27/2003</u> . 6) Other:								

Art Unit: 3626

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# **Notice To Applicant**

1. This communication is in response to the response to the Restriction Requirement/Election Requirement filed 5/4/2006. Claims 1-20 and 28-42 are pending. Claims 4 and 10 have been amended. Claims 21-27 have been cancelled. Claims 36-42 are newly added. Claims 1-9, 28-35, and 41-42 have been elected. The IDS statements filed 5/23/2002, 6/4/2002, 6/27/2002 and 2/27/2003 have been entered and considered.

#### Election/Restrictions

2. Claims 10-14, 15-20 and 36-40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/5/2006.

Art Unit: 3626

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell (<u>www.rli.com</u>; hereinafter Rockwell), in view of Lavin et al. (5,772,585; hereinafter Lavin).
- (A) As per claim 1, Rockwell discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for storing laser accident and incident information comprising:
  - (1) an incident table containing an entry for each of a plurality of incidents, each entry carrying an identification (Rockwell: pg. 5); and
  - (2) a laser table containing at least one entry for at least one entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said laser table containing a laser identification (Rockwell: pg. 6).

Art Unit: 3626

Rockwell, however, fails to expressly disclose a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for storing laser accident and incident information comprising:

(3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing clinical evaluation information.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for storing laser accident and incident information comprising:

(3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing clinical evaluation information (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-19).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

- (B) As per claim 2, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the data structure according to claim 1, wherein said clinical evaluation table contains a clinical identification for each entry, said data structure further comprising:
  - (1) an examination table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said clinical evaluation table linked by the clinical identification, said examination table containing evaluation information and an examination identification.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses the data structure according to claim 1, wherein said clinical evaluation table contains a clinical identification for each entry (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-19), said data structure further comprising:

(1) an examination table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said clinical evaluation table linked by the clinical identification, said examination table containing evaluation information and an examination identification (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-24).

Art Unit: 3626

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

- (C) As per claim 4, Rockwell discloses the data structure according to claim 1, further comprising a bibliography table containing a corresponding entry for each entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said bibliography table containing bibliographic information for the incident corresponding to said identification (Rockwell: pg. 3).
- (D) As per claim 8, Rockwell discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for injury information comprising:
  - (1) an injury table containing an entry for each of a plurality of injuries, each entry having an identification (Rockwell: pg. 6); and
  - (2) a cause table containing a corresponding entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said cause table containing a description of how the injury occurred (Rockwell: pg. 6).

Rockwell, however, fails to expressly disclose a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for injury information comprising:

(3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing medical information.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for injury information comprising:

(3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing medical information (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-19).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

(E) As per claim 9, Rockwell discloses the data structure according to claim 8, further comprising a source table containing a corresponding entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said source table containing information relating to the source of the information (Rockwell: pg. 3).

Art Unit: 3626

(F) Claim 41 substantially repeats the same limitations as those in claim 1 and therefore, is rejected for substantially the same reasons given for claim 1 and incorporated herein.

- (G) As per claim 42, Rockwell discloses the data structure according to claim 41, wherein said incident table includes a summary section and an exposure section (Rockwell: pg. 6).
- 5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell and Lavin, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Joao (6,283,761; Joao).
- (A) As per claim 3, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the data structure according to claim 2, further comprising:
  - (1) an images table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination identification, said images table containing data to form digital representations of the injury occurring from the incident; and
  - (2) an examination type table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination

identification, said examination type table containing an identification of an examination given to an injured subject.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin and Joao. In particular, Lavin and Joao disclose the data structure according to claim 2, further comprising:

- (1) an images table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination identification, said images table containing data to form digital representations of the injury occurring from the incident (Joao: abstract; col. 7, lines 49-61; col. 16, line 66-col. 17, line 12); and
- (2) an examination type table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination identification, said examination type table containing an identification of an examination given to an injured subject (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-24).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Joao with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

Art Unit: 3626

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Joao with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of processing medical information (Joao: col. 7, lines 62-65).

- 6. Claims 5-6, and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell and Lavin, as applied to claims 1 and 28 above, and further in view of Official Notice.
- (A) As per claim 5, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the computer-readable medium according to claim 1, wherein the computer-readable medium is a carrier wave.

Nevertheless, Official Notice is taken that the technique of using carrier waves as computer-readable mediums to transmit information is old and well known. Using modulated radio signals is an example of this technique and was old and well known at the time of the present invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine this technique with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of facilitating the transmission of information.

(B) As per claim 6, Rockwell discloses a system comprising:

(1) means for storing a database of incidents (Rockwell: pg. 3); and

(2) means for displaying information queried from said storing means by said query means (Rockwell: pg. 6).

Rockwell, however, fails to *expressly* disclose a system comprising:

(3) means for querying information from said storing means.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a system comprising:

(3) means for querying information from said storing means (Lavin: col. 14, lines 36-47).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

Examiner has also taken Official Notice of the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the

aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, and networks. These techniques and technologies were widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access<sup>®</sup>, Microsoft Explorer<sup>®</sup>, Google<sup>®</sup>, and Yahoo<sup>®</sup>, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

- (C) As per claim 28, Rockwell discloses a laser accident and incident registry system comprising:
  - a database storing the laser accident and incident registry, said database connected to said interface engine (Rockwell: pg. 3).

Rockwell, however, fails to expressly disclose a laser accident and incident registry system comprising:

(2) a controller having a browser (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63); and

(3) an interface engine connected to said controller (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63).

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a laser accident and incident registry system comprising:

- (2) a controller having a browser (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63); and
- (3) an interface engine connected to said controller (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

Examiner has also taken Official Notice of the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, and networks. These techniques and technologies were

Art Unit: 3626

widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access<sup>®</sup>, Microsoft Explorer<sup>®</sup>, Google<sup>®</sup>, and Yahoo<sup>®</sup>, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

(D) Examiner has taken Official Notice of claims 29-35. As previously mentioned, the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, template libraries, and networks. These techniques and technologies were widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access®, Microsoft Explorer®, Google®, and Yahoo®, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell and Lavin

Art Unit: 3626

with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

- 7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell, Lavin, and Official Notice, as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Fernandez et al. (5,956,720; hereinafter Fernandez).
- (A) As per claim 7, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the system according to claim 6, wherein said query means includes:
  - (1) means for storing query definitions; and
  - (2) means for recalling previous query definitions from said query storing means.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Fernandez. In particular, Fernandez discloses the system according to claim 6, wherein said query means includes:

- (1) means for storing query definitions (Fernandez: col. 2, lines 46-57); and
- (2) means for recalling previous query definitions from said query storing means (Fernandez: col. 4, lines 7-23).

Art Unit: 3626

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Fernandez with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data (Fernandez: col. 2, lines 41-45).

Page 16

Examiner has also taken Official Notice of the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, and networks. These techniques and technologies were widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access®, Microsoft Explorer®, Google®, and Yahoo®, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell, Lavin and Fernandez with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

Art Unit: 3626

#### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied art teaches systems and methods for performing crawl searches and index searches (US 2002/0147880); a system for composing a graphical interface to a relational database which displays a network of query and source icons (5,428,776); an imaging system protocol handling method and apparatus (6,272,469); a method and apparatus for reporting emergency incidents (6,594,634); a computer-implemented process for reporting injured worker information (6,065,000); and a method and apparatus for utilizing annotations to facilitate computer retrieval of database material (5,404,295).

The cited but not applied prior art also includes non-patent literature by IDG Books Worldwide ("Windows 95 For Dummies" Copyright1995.); IDG Books Worldwide ("Excel For Windows 95 For Dummies" Copyright 1995.); IDG Books Worldwide ("The Internet For Dummies" Copyright 1995.); IDG Books Worldwide ("Client/Server Computing For Dummies" Copyright 1999.); Faithe Wempen ("10 Minute Guide to Access 97" Copyright 1995. Que Corporation.); and Frank J. Derfler, Jr. & Les Freed ("How Networks Work" Copyright 2000. Que Corporation.).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Tomaszewski whose telephone number is (571)272-8117. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

Art Unit: 3626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571)272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

мт ₩

C. LUKE GILLIGAN PATENT EXAMINER